

## REMARKS

### Interview Summary

On October 16, 2003, the undersigned had a telephone interview with Examiner Marschel to discuss the Amendment and Remarks document filed October 10, 2003. At that time, no agreement was reached and the arguments submitted by Applicant were rejected by the Examiner.

INTERVIEW SUM. OK  
AM 4-2-04

An interview was conducted at the United States Patent and Trademark Office on December 9, 2003 to discuss the present application. Co-inventor Michael Natan and the undersigned were present at this meeting. In order to expedite prosecution of this case, Applicants agreed to amend the claims to further differentiate the invention from the prior art. At the same time, Applicants expressly maintained disagreement with the Examiner's pending rejection of the claims and specifically reserved the right to appeal the rejection of the then-pending claims in a related application. In light of this agreement, Applicants presented the Examiner with a series of potential claim amendments that included limitations that clearly differentiated the present invention from the prior art. Among these claims were both product-per-se claims and product-by-process claims. Examiner Marschel agreed to review both types of claims in a further submission without issuing an additional restriction requirement. Examiner Marschel also agreed to review this Supplemental Amendment and Remarks document prior to taking action on the Amendment and Remarks document filed October 10, 2003.

### Claim amendments

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the Examiner's determination that claim 15 is allowed.

In the pending office action, claims 1-5, 7-10, 16, 17 and 87 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,132,278, Claims 1-3, 7-9, 16, 17 and 87 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Swift et al., U.S. Patent No.